1/26/72

Dear Howard,

you did right to send me the ned article, as you did to over-ride jerry's judgement, which you card puts as "suggesting i not send it to you 'cause you'd have a shit fit." your comment is also in point, "Poor judgement. You should have seen this." you do not say why. because, as you can see, i a, not having a fit, aside from whatever impelled you to evaluate jp's judgement aspoor, i want o address one aspect, for among the thing jp has to learn is how the weak fight the strong and in general how to fight and look forward to something more meaningful than martyrdom. i think that you should, when you have time, discuss this jp for several reasons, including his learning and so that he will not make the same mistake again.

i had intended writing you about something else and may. my thumb is swollen, which means typing with one hand, and my mind works much too rapidly for me to try and write this slowly. and, until i get sun lighting from the side, posting the corrections in the intro to pm can not be done safely because of the dangers of shadows remaining.

as you and jp both know from when i was sending you copies of my letters to ned because he was sending his to you, we had a specific agreement that he would under no circumstances discuss any of the contents of p.m. to anyone without my advabce approval. he sought it in one case, a man named harder who is a friend of john cowles, who he wanted to interest in publishing condensation. now it took me months to get my stuff back, many unanswered letters. finally, after i knew of the lattimer thing, i get it back in a rush. my unanswered requests include his assurances that he has kept his word and also has not made any copies. to date no response, and my most recent repetition was when you were here.

as you also know, i have been trying to figure out why this crazy thing was done, why it was done at this time, not, say, 10/29 or two years hence. you should know that there was no need to do anything and that there was no demand and less public interest than ever. you know other things, too, but these alone require that we see if we can find an acceptable answer to why this was done at all and especially at this time. the only answer i can think of is to decrease or eliminate the possibilities of my raising money to print p.m., the contents of which ned and you alone among the critics know (last and hottest part, that is) and to eliminate, as it would, any possibility of commercial interest, which any such story in the times could be expected to accomplish. now among those ned planned to interview are only those i nailed to the wall-or those all of whom have a strong interest in killing this book. i refused but offered what even gary says is a vy fair substitute:when the full book was printed and before binding, send them copies and solicit responses to be printed in the appendix. i even told ned, as you may remember, that were they to call me the worst kinds of names i'd print that. he would not agree, feeling that his unique genius would get from them abject confessions in interviews. he sits ob a board with at least one of these cats.

so i have two problems, aside from ned's emotional ones: has he broken his word, and if so, how and to what degreex, and why this whole business now? this means any kind of clue may be important. incidently, grs has agreed to push ned for an answer. we had a long, long talk about this and what is related and grs heard those phone conversations that logically followed the ones you heard, same guy, new info. important, too, and vy much bearing on this.

i read the clip in haste in town this a.m. and it is not now important enough to reread. i'll file it under ned with this whether or not i reread later. there is a clue in it that i noticed in skimming. careful readind may indicate more. two clue, one to ned's incompetence and lack of understanding. he got this story because of heft, and the length not from quality on content. the most comprehensible single criticism of what latt. said is that it is totally and completely impossible. next, no criticism of government is interesting when there can be no question that lattimer could not qualify under the contract and all those refused did. in a twocolumn story? were i paranoid and looking for an agent establishing a cover, i'd say this fits. but i do not think it. i point out how bad it is. but the simple, obvious and comprehensible things ned does not say.

of course, there is no patent on criticism of the single-bullet theory. what interests me is that of all the formulations possible, ned used one from p.m. sole coles to that formulation i think it is almost word for word.

it is relatively minor that ned did not know of no neck fragments in the autopsy report until he read p.m., which thus becones his source, that he ha made no independent study of any kind, all of his knowl dge coming from reading books. so, he took this from the panel part of p.m., which he was condensing. the incompetence of it is apparent when you understand wh_t you do, and to those without that knowledge when they consider that without knowing the size and weight of the new frags one can draw no conclusions from them alone. but one with your knowledge knows that this treatment, which is inadequate, could have been overwhelming if ned gad done any work or really understood the stuff.

one of tbe keys to the plagiarosm and the violation of his word is his wrong description of the panel as "four pathologists". and next is the overt plagiarism from this same part of p.m. and nowhere else, the placing of the hole in the head, attributed to the panel as "four inches higher than the original autopsy". now this is an error i made on purpose. the correct formulation is that their measurement of the x-rays places it 100 mm higher. i know tha usual scale. only if the exposure was life-size can it be said as i said it, for my own _n to this day i think unexplained reasons, thus only by stealing what he had promised to keep in confidence and what i do have copyrighted could he have repeated a wrong formulation, as in passing i note sm also did also without attribution. as you know, even if he were using the n.o.testimony, he knew he was ising my work. but he cannot have used that, if he even has it, because this is not at all what finck testified to and it is what he disputed rather forcefully.

when you consider the pufi ery of ned that follows, i think it enough to say q.e.d.

but so you will know, i put it this way as a trap for the panel that, if i did not tell you, you might want to thing about.

i may or may not write grs about this because he is in the middle. i may or may not write ned, but if i do it will be a provocative, short letter. i'll send you and jp copies if i do. i will not immediately. GRS has been back only 5 days. i should give him a week, and unless something else happens or is about to, i will give him at least that much, unless i decide on a very simple, general thing to tip him off without telling him what the proof is.

so, as his friends, let us address dear jp, of who i do feel as i would of a son. but i have learned also that most of the younger ones resent what they describe as my fatherly attitude. therefore, you being closer to his age and younger, i hope you will see fit to address this which you correctly describe as an error in judgement in your own way. you did not tell me your reasons, but i do give you some of mine. and something with which you may disagree and i ask you to keep strictly confidential. jerry's emotional develo ment has not kept up with his years once you get past the penis. he rebels against growing up. so, while in most ways he is quite mature and has a very good mind that he generally uses excellently, please be careful not to formulate anything that in this context could give him offense, and he would take offense at what you, although 7 years younger, most likely would not. carbon me so that when he discusses it with me, as at some point if you persuade him he will, i will be hep. and, so you will not misunderstand, i do not interpret this as the backfiring of what ned may have caused. i regard that as possible, as i explained to gary, in which event i should know to be able to avoid more hurt to ned, who clearly has emotional problems at the least tied to his great wealth and the current manner of its increase, if you read the papers. both major sources in a single day were attacked by the NIXON administration, getting large tv play. weyerhauser (polution plus) and general mills (monopoly). I am confident he also has others. this merely adds to what i knew to be possible evidence of a willingness to be and a record of being dishonest with this material. and he an ethics major! despite the crap in the paper, he is and he is up to his thesis. one other proble, he faced is the insistence of a mercenary wife that he concentrate on that, after she got him to put all his available cash in an excessively elaborate home. he